

REMARKS

Claim 12 is, again, rejected based on Delaney.

Claim 12 calls for a system which implements the following sequence:

1. An on-line meeting is established between the processor-based system and the remote processor-based system;
2. The remote processor-based system provides information to the processor-based system, related to information to be transmitted by the remote processor-based system;
3. The processor-based system determines whether that information is already stored in a local cache associated with the processor-based system; and
4. The processor-based system retrieves the locally cached information if available.

In Delaney, what happens is the processor-based system realizes that it needs a data package. It queries remote systems to see whether any of those remote systems have the package. If any of those remote systems have the package, the processor-based system downloads the package from that remote system.

Several differences then appear from the claims. In Delaney, the processor-based system does not receive data from the remote processor-based system related to “information to be transmitted.” In other words, in Delaney, the processor-based system queries remote processor-based systems, which then respond. But that response is not about information that the remote processor-based system intends to distribute to the processor-based system. It relates to information requested by the processor-based system.

In contrast, in the claimed invention, someone who wants to transmit something to you lets you know what that thing is so that you can determine whether or not you need it. There is no corresponding rationale, principle or operation in Delaney.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

In claim 22, there are several differences from Delaney. Firstly, the first processor-based system only sends information to the second processor-based system about proffered information. This never occurs in Delaney. Moreover, in the claimed invention, the proffered information relates to information already displayed on the first processor-based system.


Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For the reasons described above, claim 24 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2005



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation